



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/593,717	09/21/2006	Ikuo Nuno	0121/0059	3118

21395 7590 04/01/2011  
LOUIS WOO  
LAW OFFICE OF LOUIS WOO  
717 NORTH FAYETTE STREET  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER
----------

FISHER, MICHAEL J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3689

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

04/01/2011

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/593,717	<b>Applicant(s)</b> NUNO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> MICHAEL J. FISHER	<b>Art Unit</b> 3689	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 33-52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 33-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                    | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 38-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims are directed toward software per se and as such, are non-statutory.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 33-35,38-40,43-45 and 48-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu.

As to claims 33,38,43,48, Liu discloses an electronic service manual generator (abstract, first line) with an original data acquisition step (fig 1), a structure definition acquisition step (14), a structured data generation step based on the structure definition step (42, fig 4), the computer employs the original data, it includes original drawing structure (col 5, lines 47-50), a parts data table is obtained and used (col 5, lines 56-62). Liu does not, however, specifically teach a “voltage value table”, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include a voltage value table as these are old and well known to be necessary for electronic equipment and therefore, it would be included in the manual as Liu discloses a complete manual.

Liu does not specifically teach when the main text is obtained, however, it would be obvious to ensure the structure definition information is obtained so the structure could be kept (as for instance, in the MM Document at 31 in fig 3), Liu further does not specifically teach obtaining the structure definition of graphics, however, it would be obvious to obtain this structure data as the data is shown to be included in the manual generated and therefore, it would be easier to read if it is structured as intended, Liu further does not teach when parts table data is obtained, however, it would be obvious to obtain it at the same time as this would ensure it comes from the same source as it would be easy to import the wrong data if the user continually goes back to import more data instead of doing it all at once,

As to claims 34,39,44,49, Liu discloses the structure definition information (the manual), Liu does not, however, specifically teach an “IC function table”, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include an IC function table as these are old and well known to be necessary for electronic equipment and therefore, it would be included in the manual as Liu discloses a complete manual.

As to claim 35,50, the examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known to use SVG or SVGZ formats, therefore it would be obvious to structure the data according to SVG or SVGZ format as these known as good formats to use for structured data.

As to claims 40,45, Liu does not specifically teach using XML, however, the examiner takes Official Notice that XML is old and well known in the art as being useful for hyperlinks and Liu discloses the manual as having hyperlinks (title), therefore, it would be obvious to use XML to create the hyperlinks. It further would be obvious to use industry standard formats so that the manuals could be read easily.

Claims 36,37,41,42,46,47,51 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu as applied to claims 33-35,38-40,43-45 and 48-50 above, and further in view of US PAT 6,295,542 to Corbin.

As to claims 36,41,46,51, Liu discloses including a parts generation step including drawings obtained as original data (col 5, lines 56-62).  
Liu does not, however, teach having a comparison section for comparing related features.

Art Unit: 3689

Corbin discloses a method of for cross-referencing related text (title) in a hyperlinked document (abstract, lines 1-3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system as disclosed by Liu with the comparison section cross-referencing related parts as taught by Corbin as both are related to hyperlinked documents and Corbin teaches this as a good way to allow a user to see related links.

As to claims 37,42,47,52, Liu does not, however, specifically teach an “IC function table”, however, the examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known to use IC function tables when using IC functions, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include an IC function table as these are old and well known to be necessary for electronic equipment and therefore, it would be included in the manual as Liu discloses a complete manual.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 12/27/11 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. As to arguments that Liu does not teach creating an electronic manual, the examiner disagrees. Liu takes a non-electronic manual and creates an electronic one from the data, exactly as claimed in the instant application. The hyper-linked document is the new “manual”, thereby meeting the limitations as claimed.

Art Unit: 3689

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL J. FISHER whose telephone number is (571)272-6804. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 7:30am-5:00pm alt Fri. off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janice Mooneyham can be reached on 571-272-6805. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael J Fisher/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3689

MF  
3/12/11